

Disclosure

of things evolutionists don't want you to know

Volume 22 Issue 9

www.ScienceAgainstEvolution.info

June 2018

SCIENCE INSANITY

A computer model could show erosion carved Mount Rushmore.

It is a known scientific fact that wind and rain cause rocks to erode. Mount Rushmore is made out of rock. Therefore, Mount Rushmore must be eroding. Scientists can measure the erosion rate—and they might have. Even if they haven't, they can estimate the erosion rate based on measurements of erosion of similar rocks.

Knowing (or guessing) how fast Mount Rushmore is eroding, and making some assumptions about how Mount Rushmore used to look, one could program a computer to show how Mount Rushmore eroded from its original shape to its current shape, which just happens to look like the faces of four United States presidents. Not only that—the computer simulation could show exactly how long the erosion process must have taken based on actual measurements of current erosion measurements and accepted assumptions. Sadly, nobody has.

Of course, that's silly. But is it really any sillier than the computer simulations showing how the continents have moved over millions of years?¹



¹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pangaea>

This last month I've been amazed at all the ridiculous speculation in the supermarket science tabloids about ghost species, the formation of stars and planets, characteristics and composition of planets orbiting stars many light-years away from us, and past levels of oxygen in the atmospheres of Earth and Mars (and their temperatures) over the past hundreds of millions of years, based on nothing more than computer simulations.

Yes, I believe Armstrong, Collins, and Aldrin really did fly Apollo 11 to the Moon and back. I'm not a kook who doesn't believe in space travel. Despite my belief in space travel, I don't believe Han Solo shortened the 20 parsec Kessel run to less than 12 parsecs,² despite the fact that graphics showing how Solo shortened the distance (by taking the Millennium Falcon through the Akkadese Maelstrom) are much better quality than the TV pictures I watched when Apollo 11 went to the Moon.

I know the difference between science and science fiction—but I am beginning to think I am in the minority! So much of what is passed off as "science" in the supermarket science tabloids is so ridiculous that it goes beyond the realm of science fiction straight into the land of science insanity. I blame the theories of evolution.

Perhaps I should not put all the blame on the theories of evolution. Today, popular culture encourages acceptance of nonsense as reality. In the 1950's, Captain Video always wore a helmet when he stepped out of his space ship on another planet. Now the only ones who wear helmets are Imperial Storm Troopers (because it is part of their cheap plastic armor which clearly

² <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jvchamary/2018/05/30/solo-star-wars-story-kessel-run-12-parsecs/#35f4c9493785>

provides absolutely no protection from blasters, and merely impedes their motion).

Belief in evolution has made it acceptable to think that what “could” have happened, actually did happen, even if the preponderance of scientific evidence is that it could not have happened. When you teach children that birds evolved from dinosaurs, it is no wonder they will believe anything!

THE INSANITY STACK

Here are a few excerpts from some incredible “science” stories from the past few weeks. There could have been more, but I threw some really stupid stories straight into the wastebasket (because they were too foolish to merit attention) before I thought of writing this article.

Even though most of the stories in my insanity stack have nothing to do with evolution, they all show how the wildest speculation is confused with real science.

So, with that introduction, let’s start with this quote from an article in *Discover* dealing with quasars:

The unexplained emissions, according to Wang and Loeb, may stem from a more subtle feature of every quasar: their milder but steadier outflows. What a black hole doesn’t eat, or shoot away in jets, it flings off at relatively moderate speeds — a few thousand miles per second, or about 1 percent the speed of light. After interacting with the local gas, these outflows can ultimately produce small amounts of all three components of the high-energy background: gamma rays, neutrinos and cosmic rays.³

In other words, measurements of radiation from quasars didn’t match expectations, so they have guessed again.

Remember, black holes originally got their name because they are supposedly so massive that their gravity is so strong that not even light can escape from them, making them appear black. Now, black holes “fling off at relatively moderate speeds” all kinds of radiation.

Moving on, quantum physics is always good for a laugh. Consider this excerpt from *Scientific American*:

Their experiment, which the researchers say could be carried out within a few months,

³ Steve Nadis, *Discover*, June 2018, “As the Mighty Quasars Flow”, <http://discovermagazine.com/2018/jun/as-the-mighty-quasars-flow>

should enable scientists to sneak a glance at where an object—in this case a particle of light, called a photon—actually resides when it is placed in a superposition. And the researchers predict the answer will be even stranger and more shocking than “two places at once.”⁴

The author of that article in *Scientific American* told us about a quantum physics experiment that hasn’t even been done yet—but he expects will produce shocking unexpected results.

“Science” has evolved to the point where experiments don’t even have to be done. All you have to do is think about performing an experiment in the future, and you can draw conclusions from what you think the outcome of that experiment should be. And you can be sure, the outcome will be “even stranger and more shocking” than what was previously believed because what you used to believe was wrong.

Turning to the realm of particle physics, we are told:

Such a particle, if it exists, would transform the foundations of particle physics and could help solve cosmic puzzles like the existence of dark matter, an unidentified inert substance that makes up the preponderance of the matter in the universe.⁵

Let that sink in. This particle, which may not even exist, explains dark matter, an inert substance. “Inert” means it doesn’t interact with anything. Since it doesn’t interact with anything, it can’t be detected. It doesn’t interact with light so you can’t see it. It doesn’t interact gravitationally with anything else, so you can’t weigh it. But they say it could solve cosmic puzzles if it turns out to make up the preponderance of all the matter in the universe! We wonder, if it is inert (and therefore does not interact with anything) how can dark matter affect anything in any way?

Did you ever wonder what happens when two neutron stars collide? Fess up! We know you have! You thought they formed a more massive dead star, didn’t you? You were wrong! ☺

If the pair of neutron stars united to form an even more massive dead star, then researchers

⁴ Philip Ball, *Scientific American*, 21 May 2018, “Quantum Physics May Be Even Spookier Than You Think”, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/quantum-physics-may-be-even-spookier-than-you-think/>

⁵ Emily Conover, *Science News*, 1 June 2018, “Mysterious neutrino surplus hints at the existence of new particles”, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/mysterious-neutrino-surplus-hints-existence-new-particles?tgt=nr>

would expect that mega-neutron star to be surrounded by a bright shell of high-energy particles — similar to the Crab Nebula, but much brighter (*SN Online: 6/13/08*). X-rays coming from the site of the crash were far too faint to match this explanation, leading the team to conclude that **the collision birthed a black hole instead.**⁶

Could it be that the reason why astronomers are always surprised that their observations fail to match their expectations is that **their Big Bang model is completely wrong?**

They “concluded” that a collision between a pair of neutron stars “birthed” a black hole. That is pure speculation—not science.

GIVE ‘EM A HAND!

Turning to evolution, you might be shocked to learn that **part of our evolutionary story isn’t what was once believed!** ☺ Actually, you should not be shocked because **you have heard that in nearly every story about evolution you have ever read** in the professional literature—not just in the supermarket science tabloids. That’s because the theory of evolution is just a story, not a scientific discovery of physical laws. Physical laws don’t change—but stories do.

Fossils reveal that right-handedness goes much further back in our evolutionary story **than once believed.** Recent research has shown that handedness and language do not, er, go hand in hand, at least in the way **we once thought.** And in 2017, neuroscientists **suggested** that the origin of **handedness is not even in the brain.**⁷

Since this silly story is related to evolution, let’s look at it more closely.

The fossil record of hominins — humans, our ancestors and closest evolutionary kin going back to the split from other primates about 7 million years ago — **is mostly fragmentary, making it impossible to determine handedness** by studying limb bones.

In the 1980s, researchers **analyzed stone tools, trying to gauge hand dominance** from the direction the material was flaked, or chipped. While initially promising, **the idea proved**

⁶ Maria Temming, *Science News*, 1 June 2018, “A neutron star crash may have spawned a black hole”, <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/neutron-star-crash-may-have-spawned-black-hole?tg=nr>

⁷ Gemma Tarlach, *Discover*, June 2018, “Was Science Wrong About Being Right?”, <http://discovermagazine.com/2018/jun/was-science-wrong-about-being-right>

unreliable.⁸

Then, Frayer began to look at **striations on Neanderthal teeth.** These furrows appeared only on the outer faces of mostly the upper teeth, at the front of the mouth. One direction of diagonal marks, either from upper right to lower left or upper left to lower right, would dominate.

Individuals working with tough, fibrous material, **Frayer reasoned, could have** held it between their teeth and one hand, then used an edged stone tool to saw off a small piece with the other hand. Every now and then, the tool edge would **hit (ouch) the outer face of the upper teeth.**

It is true is that **the fossil record of hominins is fragmentary.** Not only is that a convenient excuse for why there is no proof of human evolution, the less evidence there is, the easier it is to make up a story.

According to the story, anthropologists used to think that they could figure out how arrowheads and other sharp stone tools were made. This would tell them if the maker used his right or left hand. Frayer (and perhaps others) thinks that the analysis of those anthropologists was unreliable. We suspect those anthropologists (and perhaps others) would disagree with Frayer. So, it all comes down to a question of, “Who do you believe?” Without knowing who got his PhD from the better university, you can’t know who is right! ☺

MODERN SCIENCE IS ANTI-SCIENCE

We are sometimes accused of being “anti-science” because we reject the theory of evolution, and therefore must reject all science. That, of course, is nonsense.

After teaching science for two years at a major Midwestern university (admittedly better known for its football team than science department) I spent 33 1/3 years (for the record) using science to protect the citizens of a well-known, free world nation. I know when “BS” stands for Bachelor of Science, and when it stands for something else.

Is there anything less scientific than *Scientific American* reporting the results of a quantum physics experiment that hasn’t been done yet, but will certainly produce results “even stranger and more shocking than two places at once?” Maybe there is. **Just read this month’s *Evolution in the News* column** (*New Scientists Believe in Ghosts*) to learn *New Scientist* reported the discovery of a ghost ape **and decide for yourself.**

⁸ *ibid.*

THINK BIG

How did we get so big-headed?

The headline of a three-paragraph article on page 17 of the 2 June 2018, issue of *New Scientist* caught our eye. It claimed to reveal, “The real reason our brains evolved.” Spoiler alert: It didn’t. However, it reminded us that we haven’t addressed brain evolution recently, so we looked into it. The article was based on a study published last month in the professional journal, *Nature*, so we went straight to the source.

Abstract

The human brain is unusually large. It has tripled in size from Australopithecines to modern humans and has become almost six times larger than expected for a placental mammal of human size. Brains incur high metabolic costs and accordingly a long-standing question is why the large human brain has evolved. The leading hypotheses propose benefits of improved cognition for overcoming ecological, social or cultural challenges. However, these hypotheses are typically assessed using correlative analyses, and establishing causes for brain-size evolution remains difficult. Here we introduce a metabolic approach that enables causal assessment of social hypotheses for brain-size evolution. Our approach yields quantitative predictions for brain and body size from formalized social hypotheses given empirical estimates of the metabolic costs of the brain. Our model predicts the evolution of adult *Homo sapiens*-sized brains and bodies when individuals face a combination of 60% ecological, 30% cooperative and 10% between-group competitive challenges, and suggests that between-individual competition has been unimportant for driving human brain-size evolution. Moreover, our model indicates that brain expansion in *Homo* was driven by ecological rather than social challenges, and was perhaps strongly promoted by culture. Our metabolic approach thus enables causal assessments that refine, refute and unify hypotheses of brain-size evolution.

Main

The leading hypotheses for the evolution of brain size make different suggestions as to which cognitive challenges have been the most important in driving brain expansion. ‘Ecological-intelligence’ hypotheses emphasize

challenges posed by the non-social environment, for example, finding, caching or processing food (Fig. 1). By contrast, ‘social-intelligence’ hypotheses emphasize challenges posed by the social environment, for example, cooperating for resource extraction, manipulating others, avoiding manipulation or forming coalitions and alliances to outcompete others (Fig. 1).⁹

First, “Why did anyone expect our brains to be six times smaller?” Clearly, their expectations were wrong because our brains are the size they are. End of story.

Second, although this isn’t the first time that someone thought thinking has been responsible for brain evolution, this is the first time that someone has been crazy enough to claim to know what kind of thinking caused brain evolution. They modeled how hard it is to think about different things, and came up with their 60-30-10 conclusion. We question their thinking.

Third, individual competition is the foundation of survival of the fittest (Darwinian Evolution). They found individual competition “unimportant for driving human brain-size evolution.” HmMMMM.

One of the editors of *Nature* was sane enough to recognize,

Finally, because the model aims to explain brain size in humans only, the results have no clear significance for debates about the evolution of intelligence in other species.¹⁰

NEW SCIENTISTS BELIEVE IN GHOSTS

Now they have discovered ghost apes!

In last month’s newsletter, we told you Arun Durvasula and Sriram Sankararaman at the University of California, Los Angeles, found a ghost lineage in our human ancestry.¹¹ To save you the trouble of following the link again, here it is again:

⁹ Mauricio González-Forero & Andy Gardner, *Nature*, 24 May 2018, “Inference of ecological and social drivers of human brain-size evolution”, pp. 554–557, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-018-0127-x>

¹⁰ Richard McElreath, *Nature*, 23 MAY 2018, “Sizing up human brain evolution”, <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05197-8>

¹¹ *Disclosure*, May 2018, “Ancestry From DNA”, <http://scienceagainstevolution.info/v22i8f.htm>

It appears the ancestors of modern Yoruba interbred with members of a distinct population, but it's not clear what this "ghost lineage" was. It might have been a group of *Homo sapiens* that remained isolated from the rest of the population for thousands of years, or it may have been another hominin species altogether.¹²

This month, an article in *New Scientist* reports the discovery of yet another ghost lineage! The subtitle of the print version of the article proclaims this "long lost relative has been hiding in bonobo DNA, finds Catherine Brahic"!¹³ Both the on-line and print versions of the article begin with this statement:

THE great ape family is about to welcome a new member. A comparison of genomes has found signs that a previously unknown species of chimpanzee once lived in the forests of central Africa.¹⁴

This species was previously unknown because there was no fossil evidence of it. There still isn't any physical evidence of this creature—but someone's interpretation of DNA analysis cannot be wrong! ☺ The print headline says, "Mystery ghost ape discovered," so it must be true!

The truth never changes—except in public school science classes. Nearly every "scientific truth" about evolution taught as fact in today's public school science classes will be shown to be wrong in tomorrow's public school science classes, so why bother to learn it?

Traditionally, it was thought that species were groups of organisms that would not produce "viable" offspring – ones capable of having babies – with any other group. But we now know that is not the case. Grizzly bears and polar bears, for instance, have begun mating as climate change squeezes their ranges together. Many other species have mated over the years. Genetic studies are revealing that "impossible" relations once happened with previously unknown extinct animals.¹⁵

¹² *New Scientist*, 7 April 2018, "African DNA hints at mystery hominin species.", page 9, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2165308-dna-from-another-mystery-human-ancestor-lingers-in-some-people/>

¹³ *New Scientist*, 2 June 2018, "Mystery ghost ape discovered", page 4, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg23831802-200-mystery-ghost-ape-species-found-hidden-in-bonobos-genome/>

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

☺ Climate change can be blamed for everything!

Martin Kuhlwiilm at the Institute of Evolutionary Biology in Barcelona, Spain, went one step further by comparing the genomes of 59 wild chimpanzees and 10 wild bonobos. In each species, he looked for unusual DNA: fragments that could neither be explained by ancient matings with the other species, nor by random mutations.

That DNA, he reasoned, had to have another origin altogether, a ghost source. This statistical method has previously been used to identify extinct human species.

Kuhlwiilm found no ghost DNA in common chimps. But "bonobos have regions that are unusually special compared to chimps", he said at the AsiaEvo conference in China in April. On average, roughly 1 per cent of each bonobo genome came from the ghost.

This means there was once a third [unknown] species of chimpanzee living in the forests of central Africa. From his genetic data, Kuhlwiilm was able to determine that it probably split from the common ancestor of chimps and bonobos 3 to 4 million years ago.¹⁶

Or, it means the premise of evolution is wrong.

Kuhlwiilm found no ghost DNA in common chimps. That's a relief! (Just kidding. I ain't afraid of no ghosts!)

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

If we are lucky, the ghost DNA might teach us something about the newest member of our great ape family, such as how much it differed from chimps and bonobos.¹⁷

What the ghost DNA really teaches you is that you don't need to call Ghost Busters—Science Against Evolution has already done the job for you!



Ghost apes are busted!

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

by Lothar Janetzko

WWW.CREATIONISM.ORG

<http://www.creationism.org/>

This site provides numerous links to the topics of Creation Science and Creationism.

This month's website review looks at www.creationism.org. From the Brief Editor's Bio link (found at the bottom of the main page) you learn that "Paul Abramson is the founder and editor of: www.creationism.org which now has introductions to Creation Science in about 90 languages, about 350 creation theory articles, over two dozen complete books and direct links to over 140 other major creation theory websites (along with a few main evolutionism sites)." Paul's interest in providing information about creationism in so many languages probably stems from the fact he has lived in Europe for about three years and in Japan for five years.

The main page of the site serves as the launching point to the many topics usually discussed on creation and evolution websites. Here you find links to: 1) Biology; 2) Evolution; 3) Great Flood; 4) Carbon-14; 5) Fossils; 6) Mutations; 7) Creationism; 8) Geology; 9) Press Release; 10) Dinosaurs; 11) Grand Canyon; and 12) Vestigial. Selecting any one of these links will guide the reader to a brief discussion of that topic by providing definitions and often links to additional related information found on other websites and in PDF files of the Creation Research Society "*Creation Matters*."

Following the introductory links, you will find additional links to: 1) Main; 2) FAQ; 3) Links; 4) EN Articles; 5) Books; 6) Images; 7) MP3; and 8) Videos. You might think it is easy to get lost following the many links on this site. Just remember that a link to Main will return you to the top page of the main site.

The next set of links on the main page of the site provides information about creation organizations found around the world and the various states of the U.S. Just select the country or state of interest.

Next you will find links to Creation Newsletters, Magazines & Journals. I found it interesting to learn about the many different publications about creation science.

Next you will find links to Creation Science Centers & Museums found around the world and the United States.

Near the bottom of the main web page you will find even more links covering more topics and providing more resources in the form of articles, books, MP3 audio teaching, stuff for kids and more.

This website indeed provides a wealth of information about creation science. There are many links you can follow that should provide interesting topics to explore.



**You are permitted (even encouraged)
to copy and distribute this newsletter.**

Disclosure, the Science Against Evolution newsletter, is edited by R. David Pogge.

All back issues are on-line at ScienceAgainstEvolution.info.